

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 26, 2005 claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Papakonstantinou et al., DTD Inference for View of XML Data, ACM, May 2000, pages 35-46 (Papakonstantinou). Claims 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moh et al., Re-engineering Structures from Web Documents, ACM June 2, 2000, pages 67-76 (Moh). Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papakonstantinou. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moh.

The above rejections were previously raised in a December 15, 2005 Office Action. In response to that Office Action, Applicants submitted a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 in conjunction with their traversal of the rejections. The current May 26, 2005 Office Action held that this Declaration was ineffective to overcome the Moh and Papakonstantinou references, inter alia, for not containing the signatures of all five inventors. This declaration has been revised to address the deficiencies noted by the Examiner and is properly signed by all of the inventors.


Applicants submit that the declaration submitted herewith clearly establishes that neither Papakonstantinou nor Moh is prior art to the present invention. As a result, the rejections raised by the Examiner are rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned counsel by telephone call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully Submitted,

Minos N. Garofalakis, et al


By: Thomas J. Onka, Esq.
Attorney for Lucent

Synnestvedt Lechner & Woodbridge LLP
P.O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542
609-924-3773 phone
609-924-1811 fax